

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH

The 3rd November, 1977

No. Z-42A/LA/B-172/3932.—In pursuance of the powers conferred under the provision of section 48 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby withdraws from the acquisition of land specified below, with respect to which a notification under section 4 of the said Act No. 42A/LA-IV/T-169/170, dated 10th January, 1977, was published in *Haryana Government Gazette* on 25th January, 1977 on page 183-184:—

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in acres	Remarks
Bhiwani	Bhiwani Khera	Sukhpura Majra (Mundhal Khurd)	18.09	137/6, 7, 8, 9/2, 12 to 15, 9/1, 138/1, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 11, 12, 14, 13/1, 13/2, 15, 16/1, 16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24/1, 24/2, 25/1, 25/2, 139/21, 151/21, 157/4, 5, 153/5, 159/21, 168/21, 152/1/1, 1/2/2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 17/3, 18, 23, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 158/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 11, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14/1, 14/2, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 169/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25, 175/5, 6, 15, 16, 25, 176/1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 187/21, 188/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10/1, 10/2, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16/1, 16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 196/5, 197/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10/1, 10/2, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 198/21, 212/5, 6, 211/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 223/5, 224/1/1, 1/2, 2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16/1, 16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 239/5, 237/21, 253/5, 238/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 254/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 263/5, 6, 15, 16, 25, 262/21 to 25, 261/21/1, 21/2, 275/1 to 5, 276/1, 288.

No. Z-42A/LA-IV/B-173/3937.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be required to be taken by Government at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, construction a link road from Bhiwani-Jind road to village Sukhpura, in Bhiwani District, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose:

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor, of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts, required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested, who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of the notification file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P. W. D., B. & R., Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATIONS

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in acres/ Hactares	Remarks/Khasra Nos.
Bhiwani	Bhiwani Khera	Sukhpura Majra Mundhal Khurd	18.09	137/6, 7, 8, 9/2, 12 to 15, 9/1, 138/1, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 11, 12, 14, 13/1, 13/2, 15, 16/1, 16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24/1, 24/2, 25/1, 25/2, 139/21, 15/21, 157/4, 5, 153/5, 159/21, 168/21, 152/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 17/3, 18, 23, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 158/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 11, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14/1, 14/2, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 169/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25, 175/5, 6, 15, 16, 25, 176/1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 187/2, 188/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10/1, 10/2, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16/1, 16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 196/5, 197/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10/2, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 198/21, 212/5, 6, 211/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 223/5, 224/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10/12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16/1, 16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 239/5, 237/21, 253/5, 238/1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2, 254/9/1, 9/2, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23, 263/2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 274/4/5, 262/21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 275/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 261/21/1, 21/2, 276/1.

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Bhiwani Circle, P.W.D., B. & R.,
Bhiwani.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 7th November, 1977

No. 11511-4Lab-77/29148.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the

Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Shanker Textile Mills, Bahalgarh Road, Sonapat :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 20 of 1977

between

SHRI PIRTHI SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SHANKAR TEXTILE
MILLS, BAHALGARH, ROAD, SONEPAT

AWARD

By order No. ID/21916 dated 4th June, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Shanker Textile Mills, Bahalgarh Road, Sonapat and its workman Shri Pirthi Singh to this court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (u) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Pirthi Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Whereas Shri R. C. Sharma appeared on behalf of the management concerned on 5th October, 1977 as their authorised representative in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them, the workman did not appear on that date despite being served with such notices through registered post. Shri Shardha Nand Solanki, General Secretary of the Textile Workers Union, Sonapat through which the workman concerned sent a notice of demand to the management with five copies to the Conciliation Officer, on the other hand made a statement that he had no instruction from the workman and that he as such did not want to pursue the demand on his behalf.

The absence of the workman and the statement of Shri Shardha Nand Solanki obviously indicate that the former is not interested in pursuing the demand raised by him on the management concerned and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I, hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

NATHU RAM JAIN,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Dated, the 24th October, 1977.

No. 2317, dated 27th October, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL, JAIN,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 11511-A-4Lab-77/29150.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Vikas Agro Engineering (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 103 of 1976

between

SHRI JAI NARAIN SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VIKAS AGRO
ENGINEERING (P) LTD., BAHADURGARH.

AWARD

By order No. ID/45735, dated 15th December, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Vikas Agro Engineering (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh and its workman Shri Jai Narain Singh, to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Narain Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court before me in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings giving rise to the following issues framed by me,—*vide* order, dated 4th May, 1977 :—

1. Whether the workman concerned abandoned the job voluntarily on 8th September, 1976 and received Rs. 400 in full and final settlement of all his dues against the management on that date?
2. Whether the workman was employed with the management against a specified job of Welding Kerlari Chulha only for a period of two months? If yes to what effect?
3. Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Narain Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Whereas the workman put in his appearance before me on 2nd July, 1977, the next date of hearing fixed in the case, the management failed to appear on that date despite being directed to do so and adduce their evidence with the result that *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against them.

The workman appeared as his own witness in *ex parte* evidence and deposed that he being a permanent employee of the management concerned as a Welder, the later terminated his services with effect from 9th September, 1976 without assigning any reasons or holding an enquiry against him and that he was entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

I, see no reasons to disbelieve the statement of the workman concerned particularly when the proceedings against the management are *ex parte* and they have failed to discharge the burden of issue so heavily placed on them.

I, thus relying on the statement of the workman concerned hold that the management terminated his services without justification and he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages. I, accordingly answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated, the 24th October, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2318, dated the 27th October, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 11522-4Lab-77/29156.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Haryana Foundry Works, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 37 of 1977

between

SHRI KALU RAM WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA
FOUNDRY WORKS, FARIDABA

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/1080-A-76/21982, dated the 4th June, 1977, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Haryana Foundry Works Faridabad and its workman Shri Kalu Ram to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Kalu Ram was justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?”

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings giving rise to the following issues framed.—*vide* order dated 15th September, 1977.—

1. Whether Shri Kalu Ram was in the employment of the management concerned as a workman during the period from 11th September, 1975 to 14th February, 1976.
2. Whether the termination of services of Shri Kalu Ram was justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?

The case having been fixed for 25th October, 1977 for recording the evidence of the workman on issue No. 1, the parties arrived at a mutual amicable settlement reduced into writing and executed by them as Ex. M-1, on that date. They affirmed the correctness of this settlement,—*vide* statements made by their authorised representatives whereby the workman admitted to have received Rs 500 in cash from the management in full and final settlement of all his claims under the demand served on the management leading to this reference. It would thus appear that the demand of the workman raised on the management leading to this reference has been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 25th October, 1977

Presiding Officer
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2327, dated the 31st October, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 11573-4Lab-77/29158.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Foundry Works, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 38 of 1976

between

SHRI NAVAL KISHORE WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA
FOUNDRY WORKS, FARIDABAD

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/1080/B-76/22012, dated 4th June, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Haryana Foundry Works, Faridabad and its workman

Shri Naval Kishore to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the retrenchment of Shri Naval Kishore was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings giving rise to the following issues framed,—*vide* order, dated 10th August, 1977 and 14th September, 1977:—

1. Whether the reference made to the Labour Court relating to the justification of retrenchment of the workman concerned, is proper and legally maintainable?
2. Whether the retrenchment of Shri Naval Kishore was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Issue No. 1. was decided against the management,—*vide* my detailed order dated 14th September, 1977. The parties arrived at a mutual amicable settlement reduced into writing and duly executed by them as Ex. M-1 and affirmed its correctness before me,—*vide* statement made by their authorised representatives in this Court on 25th October, 1977 whereby the workman admitted to have received a sum of Rs. 3629.05 in full and final settlement of the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference. It would thus appear that the demand of the workman concerned has been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated the 25th October, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2328, dated the 31st October, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

G. V. GUPTA, Secy.